



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/909,369

07/19/2001

Sean Connolly

1187

9847

7590

07/13/2005

Fay, Kaplun & Marcin, LLP  
150 Broadway  
Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038

EXAMINER

SHIMIZU, MATSUICHIRO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2635

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/909,369

Applicant(s)

CONNOLLY ET AL.

Examiner

Matsuichiro Shimizu

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/20/05.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

***Response to Amendment***

The applicant has not provided amendment to claims 1-24 in his response filed on 4/20/05.

***Response to Arguments***

Regarding applicant's arguments (line 23—25, page 3; lines 11-18, page 4) with respect to claims 1 and 14 filed on 4/20/05, the examiner maintains that Ricketts teaches event of the alarm or alert indicates that an unauthorized person is in unauthorized room or zone, and the person should be in the authorized room or zone, and therefore, this situation implies that the person is registered in the database (col. 9, lines 35-38, issuing alarm or alert database in main computer) to be in the authorized room or zone and is unregistered in the database to be in the unauthorized room or zone, wherein the person <sup>wears</sup>~~wears~~ wrist unit for identification (col. 4, lines 9-15, indication associated with alarm or alerting when the identified object wrist unit attached to the person is not in the appropriate room, wherein the person is not registered or unregistered in that room or zone area).

Therefore, rejection of claims 1-24 follows:

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 7, 11, 14, 16-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts (5,218,344).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Goldberg teaches a system for tracking portable devices comprising:

a transmitter (col. 3, lines 13-25 and col. 5, lines 21-31, transmitter in the organizer 102 via RF communication or Bluetooth communication associated with communication device 216 in the organizer 102) transmitting wireless inquiries to a plurality of portable devices (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 3-18, portable devices 104, 106, 108, etc.);

a receiver (col. 5, lines 21-31, message is received or relayed back to the organizer 102 suggests the organizer with the receiver via RF communication or Bluetooth communication associated with communication device 216 (col. 3, lines 19-25)) receiving replies to the inquiries from the portable devices (Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 3-18, portable devices 104, 106, 108, etc.);

a memory (Fig. 2, col. 2, line 49-62, data memory 204 in organizer 102 is used by the processor 202 to identify or track devices (col. 4, lines 22-34)) arrangement storing identifier data corresponding to the portable devices, the identifier data including status information (col. 3, lines 1-3, lines 11-12 (status associated with

Art Unit: 2635

alarm displayed on the output device 208); col. 4, lines 23–34, status indicator associated with targeted object; col. 6, lines 17–25, indicate the status of objects);

a processor (Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 49–62, processor 202 coupled to memory 204 arrangement) coupled to the memory arrangement and to the receiver (Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 26–29, communicating its identity to organizer 102), the processor retrieving from each reply, identifier data uniquely identifying a particular one of the portable devices (Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 13–24, unique RF signature) which generated the reply and comparing the identifier data to the stored identifier data (Fig. 2, col. 2, lines 13–24, unique RF signature is used for identification process suggests comparison or matching); and

a portable device control system coupled to the processor and controlled based on the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies (col. 2, lines 13–24, unique RF signature is used for identification process suggests comparison or matching logic for purpose of locating or tracking the object).

But Goldberg does not teach when the reply identifier data matches the stored identifier data the status information corresponding to the portable device is updated on the memory and, when the reply identifier data does not match the stored identifier data, the portable device control system provides an indication that the portable device is unregistered.

However, Ricketts teaches, in the art of tacking system, when the reply identifier data matches the stored identifier data the status information (col. 9, lines 7–19, status and id are response data) corresponding to the portable device is updated on the memory (col. 9, lines 35–38, analyzing and updating memory (or permanent record) in the main computer 11) and, when the reply identifier data does not match

the stored identifier data, the portable device control system provides an indication that the portable device is unregistered (col. 4, lines 9–15, alarm or alerting when the identified object is not in the appropriate room or unregistered room) for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include when the reply identifier data matches the stored identifier data the status information corresponding to the portable device is updated on the memory and when the identifier data does not match the stored identifier data, the portable device control system provides and indication that the portable device is unregistered in the device of Goldberg because Goldberg suggest the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies and Ricketts teaches when the reply identifier data matches the stored identifier data the status information corresponding to the portable device is updated on the memory and when the identifier data does not match the stored identifier data, the portable device control system provides and indication that the portable device is unregistered for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process.

Regarding claim 2, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the transmitter and the receiver include a Bluetooth radio transceiver which utilizes a 2.4 GHZ Short Range Radio protocol (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, Bluetooth transceiver 120).

Regarding claim 3, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the portable device includes a Bluetooth radio transceiver utilizing a 2.4 GHz Short Range Radio protocol (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, Bluetooth transceiver 120).

Regarding claim 4, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the portable devices include at least one of laptop computers, bar code scanners,

computing terminals, beepers, phones, printers and personal digital assistants (col. 3, lines 48–57, cell phone 420 for identification purposes).

Regarding claim 5, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the inquiries include an inquiry code which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies (col. 2, lines 12–25, interrogator 214 transmits inquiry code wherein the portable devices respond with unique RF signature wherein inquiry code suggests inquiry access code received by the portable device). But Goldberg does not teach the inquiries include an inquiry access code (applicant's specification [0011]; inquiries for determining which devices are within the scan range) which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies.

However, Ricketts teaches, in the art of tacking system, the inquiries include an inquiry access code which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies (col. 8, line 66 to col. 8, line 11, portable device generates proximity warning to other device in response to inquiry access code) for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the inquiries include an inquiry access code which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies in the device of Goldberg because Goldberg suggest the inquiries include an inquiry code and Ricketts teaches the inquiries include an inquiry access code which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process.

Regarding claim 7, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the portable device control system includes a sound arrangement providing a sound alert when the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier

Art Unit: 2635

data (Figs. 2 and 17, col. 3, lines 8–12, alarms associated with audible signals (speaker 212), or displayed on screen; col. 6, lines 17–25, activating alarm via display when a trusted item or identifier data is matched in a trusted environment but does not match with stored trusted party or employee can no take the item or trusted item outside zone or room).

Regarding claim 11, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein a portable device control system coupled to the processor and controlled based on the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies (col. 2, lines 13–24, unique RF signature is used for identification process suggests comparison or matching logic for purpose of locating or tracking the object). But Goldberg does not teach the device control system is activated when the identifier data retrieved from the replies does not match to the stored identifier data

However, Ricketts teaches, in the art of tacking system, the device control system is activated when the identifier data retrieved from the replies does not match to the stored identifier data (col. 4, lines 9–15; alarm when the identified object is not in the appropriate room) for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the device control system is activated when the identifier data retrieved from the replies does not match to the stored identifier data in the device of Goldberg because Goldberg suggest a portable device control system coupled to the processor and controlled based on the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies and Ricketts teaches the device control system is activated when the identifier data retrieved from the replies



Art Unit: 2635

does not match to the stored identifier data for the purpose of providing detailed tracking process.

Regarding claim 16, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 14, wherein the portable device includes a Bluetooth radio transceiver utilizing a 2.4 GHz Short Range Radio protocol (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, Bluetooth transceiver 120).

Regarding claim 17, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 14, wherein the inquiries include an inquiry access code which prompts the portable devices to generate the corresponding replies (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, response via interrogator 214).

Regarding claim 18, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 17, wherein before retrieving step, receiving the inquiries by the particular device; and generating the reply as a function of the inquiry access code (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, response via interrogator 214).

All subject matters in claim 19 are disclosed in claims 6 and 14, and therefore rejection of the subject matters expressed in claim 19 are met by references and associated arguments applied to rejection of claims 6 and 14.

Regarding claim 20, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 14 wherein the portable device control system includes a sound arrangement providing a sound alert when the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier data (col. 3, lines 4-12; col. 5, lines 55-65, if not in possession of trusted person, speaker alarm 212 is generated).

Regarding claim 23, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 14, wherein the portable device control system is activated when the identifier data retrieved from the replies does not match to the stored identifier data (col. 3, lines 4-

Art Unit: 2635

12; col. 5, lines 55–65, if not in possession of trusted person or stored identifier data, speaker alarm 212 is generated).

All subject matters in claim 24 are disclosed in claim 14, and therefore rejection of the subject matters expressed in claim 24 are met by references and associated arguments applied to rejection of claim 14.

Claims 8–10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jenkins (5,801,618).

Regarding claims 8–10, Goldberg teaches the portable device control system coupled to the processor and controlled based on the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, object 112, 104, 112 are tagged for identification purposes). But Goldberg in view of Ricketts does not teach the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, a display arrangement displaying to security personnel an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data.

However, Jenkins teaches, in the art of locating system, the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, a display arrangement displaying to security personnel an area from

which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data ( abstract, lines 10-27 and col. 3, lines 11-53, video arrangement associated with taping or recording the vehicle movement, transponder associated with the identified object or vehicle, locked state of gate in the view of video recording) for the purpose of providing remote control of objects. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, a display arrangement displaying to security personnel an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data in the device of Goldberg in view of Ricketts because Goldberg in view of Ricketts suggest the processor retrieves from the reply from the located object and Jenkins teaches the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, a display arrangement displaying to security personnel an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies

Art Unit: 2635

matches to the stored identifier data for the purpose of providing remote control of objects.

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Worger et al. (5,664,113).

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the processor retrieves from the reply from the located object (col. 5, lines 48–54, 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, response via interrogator 214). But Goldberg in view of Ricketts does not teach the processor retrieves from the reply, date and time when the reply was generated, the processor determining a corresponding employee identifying number as a function of the identifier data and storing the data and time into a data record corresponding to the employee identifying number; and a Radio Frequency Identification tag situated on each of the portable devices; and a Radio Frequency Identifier receiver coupled to the processor and being capable of detecting the presence of the tag in a predetermined area, wherein the portable device control system is activated when at least one of (a) the Radio Frequency Identifier receiver detects the tag in the predetermined area and (b) the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier data.

However, Worger teaches, in the art of asset control system, the processor retrieves from the reply, date and time when the reply was generated, the processor determining a corresponding employee identifying number as a function of the identifier data and storing the data and time into a data record corresponding to the employee identifying number (col. 5, lines 52–65 and col. 8, lines 19–61, caretakers 38 associated with tag 58 and time stamp associated with the caretaker's

performance); and a Radio Frequency Identification tag situated on each of the portable devices; and a Radio Frequency Identifier receiver coupled to the processor and being capable of detecting the presence of the tag in a predetermined area, wherein the portable device control system is activated when at least one of (a) the Radio Frequency Identifier receiver detects the tag in the predetermined area and (b) the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier data (col. 5, lines 52–56; col. 8, line 52–col. 9, line 6, predetermined area or zone wherein caretakers associated with employee ID 58 and time stamp is located) for the purpose of providing asset control. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the processor retrieves from the reply, date and time when the reply was generated, the processor determining a corresponding employee identifying number as a function of the identifier data and storing the data and time into a data record corresponding to the employee identifying number; and a Radio Frequency Identification tag situated on each of the portable devices; and a Radio Frequency Identifier receiver coupled to the processor and being capable of detecting the presence of the tag in a predetermined area, wherein the portable device control system is activated when at least one of (a) the Radio Frequency Identifier receiver detects the tag in the predetermined area and (b) the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier data in the device of Goldberg in view of Ricketts because Goldberg in view of Ricketts suggest the processor retrieves from the reply from the located object and Worger teaches the processor retrieves from the reply, date and time when the reply was generated, the processor determining a corresponding employee identifying number as a function of the identifier data and storing the data and time into a data record corresponding to the employee identifying

number; and a Radio Frequency Identification tag situated on each of the portable devices; and a Radio Frequency Identifier receiver coupled to the processor and being capable of detecting the presence of the tag in a predetermined area, wherein the portable device control system is activated when at least one of (a) the Radio Frequency Identifier receiver detects the tag in the predetermined area and (b) the identifier data retrieved from the replies matches to the stored identifier data for the purpose of providing asset control.

Claims 21–22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Jenkins (5,801,618).

Regarding claims 21–22, Goldberg teaches the method according to claim 14, further comprising the steps of: using the portable device control system coupled to the processor and controlled based on the comparison of the stored identifier data to the identifier data retrieved from the replies (col. 2, line 4 to col. 3, line 36, object 112, 104, 112 are tagged for identification purposes). But Goldberg in view of Ricketts does not teach the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data.

However, Jenkins teaches, in the art of locating system, the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are

Art Unit: 2635

received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data ( abstract, lines 10-27 and col. 3, lines 11-53, video arrangement associated with taping or recording the vehicle movement, transponder associated with the identified object or vehicle, locked state of gate in the view of video recording) for the purpose of providing remote control of objects. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data in the device of Goldberg in view of Ricketts because Goldberg in view of Ricketts suggest the processor retrieves from the reply from the located object and Jenkins teaches the locating system includes a video arrangement taping an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data, and a locking arrangement locking an area from which the replies are received when the identifier data retrieved from the corresponding replies matches to the stored identifier data for the purpose of providing remote control of objects.

Claims 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Reis et al. (5,686,902).

Regarding claim 15, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 14, wherein the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries. But Goldberg in view of Ricketts does not teach the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously.

However, Reis teaches, in the art of asset control system, the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously (col. 6, lines 46-61, one to many broadcast) for the purpose of providing all tags to respond. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously in the device of Goldberg in view of Ricketts because Goldberg in view of Ricketts suggest the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries and Reis teaches the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously for the purpose of providing all tags to respond.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldberg in view of Ricketts as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Reis et al.

Regarding claim 12, Goldberg teaches the system according to claim 1, wherein the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries. But Goldberg in view of Ricketts does not teach the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously.

However, Reis teaches, in the art of asset control system, the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously (col. 6, lines 46-61, one to many broadcast) for the purpose of providing all tags to respond. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously in the device of Goldberg in view of Ricketts because Goldberg in view of Ricketts suggest the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries and Reis teaches the transmitter transmits the wireless inquiries contentiously for the purpose of providing all tags to respond.



Art Unit: 2635

### *Conclusion*

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final act

### *Contact Information*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matsuichiro Shimizu whose telephone number is (703) 306-5841. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik, can be reached on (703-305-4704). The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703-305-3988).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703-305-8576).

Matsuichiro Shimizu  
July 8, 2005



MICHAEL HORABIK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

